

**Remarks/Arguments**

**Telephonic Interviews**

The undersigned held two telephonic interviews with the Examiner on September 5, 2007. The subject of the interviews was whether the cited prior art, U.S. Patent No. 5,735,219 (Kirker) and U.S. Patent No. 5,255,778 (Santandrea et al.) teach the Claim 1 limitation of: "actuating means, carried by said pallet, suitable for causing said first and said second support means to approach and/or move away from each other in said substantially axial direction with respect to said armature axis at said moment of receiving and/or releasing said portion of said armature."

Regarding Kirker, the undersigned pointed out that Kirker teaches that the support members are held in place by springs, but that Kirker does not teach a means, carried by the pallet, for causing the support means to approach or move away from each other. The Examiner agreed with the undersigned and stated that the anticipation rejection with respect to Kirker should be removed.

Regarding Santandrea, the undersigned showed that Santandrea teaches a device (11) for adjusting support means on a pallet (10), but that the device (11) is separate from the pallet (10), for example, as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of Santandrea. The Examiner agreed with the undersigned and stated that the obviousness rejection over Kirker and Santandrea should be removed.

**Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1 and 36 have been amended to recite the first and a second support means engaging with a portion of the shaft for the armature. Claim 22 was amended to reflect the changes in Claim 1. Claim 34 was amended to clarify the operation recited in the second limitation. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings regarding the coil winding turn recited in Claim 31. Applicant has cancelled Claim 31; therefore, the objection is moot.

Applicant courteously requests that the objection be removed.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification regarding the coil winding turn recited in Claim 31. Applicant has cancelled Claim 31; therefore, the objection is moot.

Applicant courteously requests that the objection be removed.

The Rejection of Claim 31 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner cited the limitation “a coil winding turn for said armature.” Applicant has cancelled Claim 31; therefore, the rejection is moot.

Applicant courteously requests that the objection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,735,219 (Kirker). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites: “actuating means, carried by said pallet, suitable for causing said first and said second support means to approach and/or move away from each other in said substantially axial direction with respect to said armature axis at said moment of receiving and/or releasing said portion of said shaft.”

Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate an actuating means for causing the support means to approach or move away from each other. Kirker teaches that the support members are held in place by springs, for example: “spring 30 inhibits support member 12 from moving while

the work piece is being worked upon or transported on pallet 10.” (Col. 4, lines 60-63). Further, Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate a means, carried by the pallet, for causing the support means to approach or move away from each other. Kirker implies that bases 12 and 14 can be displaced by hand or possibly by some other means that is not part of, or carried by, pallet 10.

Kirker does not show any element of pallet 10 that can displace members 12 or 14 as recited in Claim 1. For example, spring 30 does not and cannot act to displace member 12 in a direction parallel to an axis for an armature being held in the member.

In the telephone interviews of September 5, 2007, the Examiner agreed that Claim 1 was novel with respect to Kirker.

Kirker does not teach all the elements of Claim 1, therefore, Claim 1 is novel with respect to Kirker. Claims 17, 19, 22, 24, and 27, dependent from Claim 1, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

Claims 20 and 32 were cancelled in the RCE dated February 27, 2007, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicant courteously requests that the rejection be removed.

#### The Rejection of Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, and 34-38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,735,219 (Kirker) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,255,778 (Santandrea et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

#### **Claim 1**

Applicant has shown that Kirker does not teach, suggest, or motivate all the elements of Claim 1, in particular, “actuating means, carried by said pallet, suitable for causing said first and said second support means to approach and/or move away from each other in said substantially axial direction with respect to said armature axis at said moment of receiving and/or releasing said portion of said shaft.”

Santandrea teaches positioning unit (11) used to move support members (13) and (15) on pallet (10). However, Santandrea teaches that the positioning unit is separate from the pallet, for

example, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Thus, Santandrea also fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the above claim limitation.

In the telephone interviews of September 5, 2007, the Examiner agreed that Claim 1 was patentable over Kirker and Santandrea.

Kirker and Santandrea fail to teach suggest, or motivate all the elements of Claim 1; therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Kirker and Santandrea. Claims 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27, dependent from Claim 1, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker.

#### **Claim 34**

Claim 34 recites: “causing first and second supporting means on said pallet to move toward each other in a first direction parallel to an axis for said armature to insert at least one of said first and second supporting means in a portion of said armature, wherein said causing to move is performed by an actuating means carried by said pallet; and, causing, using said actuating means carried by said pallet, said first and second supporting means to move away from each other in a second direction parallel to said axis for said armature to remove said at least one of said first and second supporting means from said portion of said armature.”

Applicants have shown that neither Kirker nor Santandrea teach, suggest, or motivate an actuating means carried by the pallet; therefore, Claim 34 is patentable over Kirker and Santandrea. Claim 35, dependent from Claim 34, enjoys the same distinction with respect to Kirker and Santandrea.

#### **Claim 36**

Claim 36 recites: “actuating means, carried by said base, suitable for causing said first and said second support means to approach and/or move away from each other in said substantially axial direction with respect to said armature axis at said moment of receiving and/or releasing said portion of said shaft.” Applicants have shown that neither Kirker nor Santandrea teach, suggest, or motivate an actuating means carried by the pallet; therefore, Claim 36 is patentable over Kirker and Santandrea. Claims 37 and 38, dependent from Claim 36, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Kirker and Santandrea.

Claim 31 has been cancelled.

Applicant courteously requests that the rejection be removed.

The Objection of Claim 23 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claim 23 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 is novel with respect to Kirker and is patentable over Kirker and Santandrea. Therefore, Claim 23, dependent from Claim 1, no longer depends from a rejected base claim.

Applicant courteously requests that the objection be removed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of Claim 33.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Paul Maliszewski/

C. Paul Maliszewski  
Registration No. 51,990  
Customer No. 24041  
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC  
5555 Main Street  
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406  
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

Dated: September 7, 2007  
CPM/